

## **REMARKS**

This paper is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated March 22, 2006, within the three-month period for response. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the subject Office Action, the specification was objected to, and claims 1-21, 26-31, 35 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In addition, claim 57 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,671,818 to Mikurak, and claims 1, 3-6, 13-16 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikurak in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,971,094 to Ly and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0052797 to Maritzen et al. Claim 2 was rejected as being unpatentable over Mikurak, Ly and Maritzen in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,691 to Gomi et al. Claims 7-12 were rejected as being unpatentable over Mikurak, Ly and Maritzen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,021,437 to Chen et al. Claim 17 was rejected as being unpatentable over Mikurak, Ly and Maritzen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,643 to Cheng et al. Claims 18, 20 and 26-29 were rejected as being unpatentable over Mikurak and Maritzen in view of Ly. Claim 19 was rejected as being unpatentable over Mikurak, Maritzen and Ly in view of Gomil. Claims 21-25 were rejected as being unpatentable over Mikurak, Maritzen and Ly in view of Chen. Claim 30 was rejected as being unpatentable over Mikurak, Maritzen and Ly in view of Cheng. Claim 33 was rejected as being unpatentable over Mikurak in view of Ly, and claim 93 was rejected as being unpatentable over Mikurak and Ly in view of Cheng.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections to the extent that they are maintained. Applicants have amended the specification as required by the Examiner. In addition, Applicants have amended claims 1, 18 and 31 and added new claims 105-106. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is being added by the above amendments, as the amendments are fully supported in the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed.

As an initial matter with regard to the specification, the Examiner will note that Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, withdrawal of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested.

Now turning to the §101 rejections, and first to claim 1, Applicants note that claim 1 is an apparatus claim, and furthermore, recites in part a product support computer. An apparatus is one of the statutory classes explicitly recited in §101. Furthermore, a computer is a manifestly physical and tangible entity.

The Examiner apparently is of the opinion that compliance with §101 requires "physically transforming an article or physical object to a different state or thing." (Office Action, pages 2-3). Applicants are aware of no requirement in §101, or of the case law related thereto, demanding that an article or physical object be physically transformed.

Indeed, the Office's recent "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" states in Section IV.C.2.b that:

For eligibility analysis, physical transformation "is not an invariable requirement, but merely one example of how a mathematical algorithm [or law of nature] may bring about a useful application." AT&T, 172 F.3d at 1358-59, 50 USPQ2d at 1452. If the examiner determines that the claim does not entail the transformation of an article, then the examiner shall review the claim to determine if the claim provides a practical application that produces a useful, tangible and concrete result. In determining whether the claim is for a "practical application," the focus is not on whether the steps taken to achieve a particular result are useful, tangible and concrete, but rather that the final result achieved by the claimed invention is "useful, tangible and concrete."

Most relevant to the discussion at hand is the Guidelines' treatment of a "tangible result," which is described at subparagraph (2) of the aforementioned section:

The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a Sec. 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that Sec. 101 judicial exception to produce a real-world result.

Claim 1 recites a number of "practical applications . . . to produce a real world result." First, the claim recites agents that are configured to perform product support operations that either remedy or identify an undesirable operational condition. Remedying an undesirable operational condition unquestionably is a practical application with a real world result -- a condition that adversely affected the operation of a computer related product was resolved. Identifying an undesirable operational condition similarly is a practical application, given that not all undesirable operational conditions can be resolved via programmatic means, and the identification of the condition provides a useful, tangible and concrete result that enables product support personnel, who would otherwise have to manually figure out the source of a problem, to be informed of the problem so that they can appropriately resolve the undesirable operational condition.

Second, claim 1 recites a product support program capable of dispatching an agent to a customer computer. Applicants submit that the dispatch of an agent from one computer to another is a practical application producing a real world result. In particular, a customer computer is provided with program code that was not previously installed on the computer, whereby such program code alters how the computer operates as compared to before the program code was installed.

To remedy the §101 issue, the Examiner suggests that Applicants append the language "remedying said undesirable operational condition using a product support operation" to render claim 1 statutory. Claim 1, however, is an apparatus claim, and the Examiner is effectively suggesting Applicants add a method step to this claim, which would effectively render claim 1 into some sort of hybrid, product-by-process claim. Applicants fail to see how the addition of a method step to an apparatus claim would improve the claim from a statutory standpoint, and thus, Applicants respectfully decline to make such an amendment. Applicants also note that claim 1 already recites a product support agent that is configured to perform the very product support operation suggested by the Examiner, or alternatively another operation of identifying an undesirable operational condition, which as noted above, is similarly directed to a practical application that achieves a real world result.

The Examiner also appears to take issue with the fact that claim 1 recites that programs are "configured to perform" certain operations, rather than reciting those operations as actual steps. However, as noted above, claim 1 is an apparatus claim, and not a method claim, so reciting that a program is "configured to perform," which is a structural limitation, is more than appropriate for inclusion in an apparatus claim – much more so than would be the language suggested by the Examiner, which is more akin to a functional or method-type limitation.

Next, with respect to independent claims 18, 33, 57 and 93, each of these claims is a "computer-implemented" method, and Applicants submit that the manipulation of a computer to perform the various operations recited in these claims is in fact producing a tangible and real world result. Likewise, independent claim 31 recites a tangible computer-readable medium, and the operations capable of being performed by the recited programs are in fact producing tangible results.

In claims 18, 31 and 33, for example, agents are dispatched or distributed, and such agents are configured to remedy or identify undesirable operational conditions, similar to claim 1. In claim 57, an agent is used to analyze collected operational data, and from this analysis, an undesirable operational condition is identified. In claim 93, agents are executed to perform first and second tasks associated with remedying an undesirable operational condition. In all of these instances, practical applications are recited, and results obtained thereby are real world results.

Furthermore, with respect to the Examiner's suggested amendments to recite "remedying said undesirable operational condition using a product support operation," it should be noted that (1) this feature is already recited in a number of these claims as an operation capable of being performed by an agent, and (2) the complementary feature, that of "identifying an undesirable operational condition", is equally effective as a practical application that achieves a real world result, as noted above in connection with claim 1.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that all pending claims comply with the requirements of §101. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §101 rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

Next turning to the art-based rejections, and specifically to independent claim 1, this claim generally recites an apparatus that includes first and second product support intelligent agents configured to perform product support operations in connection with a computer-related product, wherein at least one of the first and second product support intelligent agents is configured to perform at least one of a product support operation that identifies an undesirable operational condition associated with the computer-related product and a product support operation that remedies an undesirable operational condition associated with the computer-related product, a first agent platform configured to execute on a customer computer that utilizes the computer-related product, and a product support program resident on a product support computer used in providing product support for the computer-related product, the product support program including a second agent platform, and the product support program configured to dispatch the first product support intelligent agent to the customer computer for execution by the first agent platform, and to initiate execution of the second product support intelligent agent by the second agent platform.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner primarily relies on Mikurak. However, in doing so, the Examiner relies on different passages in the reference that refer to different embodiments. Indeed, as will be noted in greater detail below, it appears the Examiner has merely performed a text search of Mikurak and cited random passages from the reference that happen to correspond to certain keywords in Applicants' claims. The Examiner, however, ignores the broader teaching of the reference, and in particular, what one of ordinary skill in the art would take from the teachings of the reference as a whole. As such, the rejection is highly reliant on hindsight in that the Examiner has essentially used Applicants' disclosure as a blueprint from which to piece together a rejection, without any supporting evidence as to any motivation in the art to combine the references in a manner that renders the claim obvious.

In particular, Mikurak is primarily directed towards a system for managing a network based supply chain. The Examiner cites col. 20, lines 44-64 for allegedly teaching a first product support intelligent agent, yet nowhere is an agent event mentioned in the passage. Instead, the passage is directed to installation management of SONET

rings. Then, the Examiner cites col. 282, line 62 to col. 283, line 12 for allegedly teaching a second product support intelligent agent. This passage, however, which is some 262 columns later in the reference, deals with a completely different embodiment related to allocating bandwidth in a network, and the reference to an agent is tangential at best. Col. 77, lines 15-17, which allegedly discloses product support agents, is related to a different, customer support embodiment. Col. 220, lines 46-56, which allegedly discloses intelligent agents, refers to an ecommerce transactional infrastructure embodiment, and mentions agents only in the context of ecommerce applications.

The Examiner relies on col. 161, lines 27-49 for allegedly disclosing the identification of an undesirable operational condition; however, this passage merely refers to web-based customer support, and does not even discuss agents, much less agents having the ability to identify undesirable operational conditions. The Examiner also relies on col. 77, lines 18-26 for allegedly disclosing resolving an undesirable operational condition. However, this passage, when read in the context of the surrounding text, refers to a multi-tier customer support process involving different levels of human customer support personnel, and has nothing to do with agents having the capability of resolving undesirable operational conditions.

Likewise, the passages cited for allegedly disclosing a first agent platform on a customer computer and a product support program resident on a product support computer, are pieced together from different embodiments, e.g., ecommerce (col. 221), a Web Architecture Framework (cols. 167-169), Java and ActiveX (col. 15), packet switching (col. 30) and scripting languages (cols. 72 and 264).

The fundamental inquiry with respect to the teachings of a reference is what the reference would teach to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicants submit that the disparate passages cited by the Examiner do not disclose or suggest first and second product support agents coupled with agent platforms running on customer and product support computers, where one intelligent agent runs on the product support computer and the other intelligent agent is dispatched from the product support computer to the customer computer.

It appears the Examiner admits as such at pages 6 and 7 by relying on Ly for allegedly disclosing product support intelligent agents, where one agent performs an operation that either identifies or remedies an undesirable operational condition in a computer-related product. Ly, however, refers only to managed and managing computers, and to the dispatch of an agent from a managing computer to a managed computer. There is no disclosure or suggestion in this reference to executing a different agent on the managing computer. Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the reference that the managing and managed computers are product support and customer computers.

As noted, for example, at page 6 of the Application, an important aspect of the invention is the provision of product support by one or more vendors of a computer-related product to the customers of the product. In this regard, claim 1 has been clarified to recite that the customer and product support computers are respectively disposed at separate customer and vendor sites and are respectively under the control of a customer that uses the computer-related product and a vendor that supplies at least a portion of the computer-related product. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 10, lines 13-20 and page 11, lines 10-20.

Neither Mikurak, nor Ly, discloses or suggests a distributed product support system that supports both the ability to dispatch intelligent agents from a product support computer at a vendor site to a customer computer at a customer site, and the ability to execute other intelligent agents on a product support computer at the vendor site. Ly, in particular, makes no distinction regarding the parties that control or otherwise manage the managing and managed computers. Furthermore, all of the agents in Ly execute on the managed computers, but not on the managing computer. Moreover, with respect to Mikurak, this reference similarly fails to disclose or suggest any particular vendor/customer relationship between different computers in a distributed system, nor does the reference disclose or suggest executing agents both on customer and product support computers. Accordingly, the combination of Mikurak and Ly fails to render claim 1 obvious.

The Examiner also relies on Maritzen for allegedly disclosing executing an agent on one computer and dispatching an agent to another computer. However, Maritzen is

directed to an ecommerce application, and does not address product support applications. As such, Maritzen fails to remedy the shortcomings in Mikurak and Ly as to the claimed feature of providing a distributed system incorporating agent platforms residing on customer and product computers disposed at customer and vendor sites. Likewise, the cited passage at paragraph [0007] merely recognizes that certain agents may be dispatchable, while others may be local. This disclosure, however, fails to suggest the provision of different product support agents that execute on customer and product support computers.

In short, none of the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests a distributed agent system incorporating agent platforms resident at customer and vendor sites, and configured to provide product support to a computer-related product used by the customer and supplied by the vendor. Furthermore, the references fail to disclose or suggest the provision of different intelligent agents capable of performing product support operations on customer and product support computers. Applicants submit that this combination of features provides comparatively greater flexibility and product support responsiveness than offered by conventional product support methodologies, and as such, represents a non-obvious advance over the art. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, and of claims 2-17 which depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

Next with regard to independent claims 18 and 31, each of these claims has been amended in a similar manner to claim 1, and recites in part the concept of a distributed agent system that dispatches a product support agent from a product support computer at a vendor site to a customer computer at a customer site, and executes another product support agent on the product support computer at the vendor site, for the purpose of providing product support for a computer-related product. As discussed above in connection with claim 1, this combination of features is not disclosed or suggested by the combination of references cited by the Examiner. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 18 and 31, as well as of claims 19-30 which depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.



Next with regard to independent claim 33, this claim generally recites a method of providing product support for a computer-related product. The method includes collecting operational data from a plurality of customer computers that utilize the computer-related product during operation of the plurality of customer computers, identifying an undesirable operational condition associated with the computer-related product from the collected operational data, wherein the identified undesirable operational condition includes a technical problem resulting in at least one of incorrect and non-optimal operation of at least one customer computer, creating a product support intelligent agent configured to remedy the undesirable operational condition, and distributing the product support intelligent agent to at least first and second customer computers from the plurality of customer computers to remedy the undesirable operational condition in the first and second customer computers, wherein at least one of collecting operational data, identifying the undesirable condition, creating the product support intelligent agent and distributing the product support intelligent agent is computer-implemented.

Of note, therefore, claim 33 recites a product support methodology whereby operational data is collected from multiple customer computers, an undesirable operational condition is identified from this data, and a product support intelligent agent is created and distributed to at least first and second customer computer to remedy the undesirable operational condition.

In rejecting claim 33, the Examiner asserts that Mikurak discloses collecting operational data from customer computers and identifying an undesirable operational condition from the collected operational data. For the former, the Examiner relies on col. 130, line 24 to col. 131, line 2, while for the latter, the Examiner relies on col. 161, lines 27-49. Of note, however, the passage at cols. 130-131 refers to a customer relationship management embodiment, and the collected data in this passage has nothing to do with the operation of a computer-related product. The passage at col. 161 refers to customer support, but not to identifying an undesirable operational condition from collected operational data, and in particular, the data collected by the completely separate customer relationship management embodiment described in cols. 130-131.

The Examiner relies on col. 221, lines 14-56 and col. 77, lines 18-26 for allegedly disclosing the creation of an intelligent agent to remedy the undesirable operational condition. However, the former passage deals with "bargain finder" agents used for shopping, while the latter passage does not specifically discuss the creation of an agent to remedy any undesirable operational condition.

The Examiner does acknowledge that Mikurak does not disclose distributing an agent to first and second customer computers, but instead relies on Ly for supplying this teaching. However, it is important to note that claim 33, as a whole describes the collection of operational data from multiple customer computers, coupled with the creation and distribution of a product support intelligent agent to multiple customer computers to remedy an undesirable operational condition identified as a result of analysis of the collected operational data. Ly is completely silent as to how or why agents are created, and there is no appreciation in the reference of the desirability of collecting operational data from multiple customer computers, and then using that collected data to create an intelligent agent that remedies an undesirable operational condition identified from the collected operational data.

Applicants submit that claim 33 recites a unique product support methodology that relies on data collection from multiple customer computers to generate a product support intelligent agent that can later be distributed to one or more of those computers to remedy an undesirable operational condition. This methodology is not appreciated by any of the references cited by the Examiner, and it is only through the benefit of hindsight that the Examiner can take isolated passages from the references to construct a rejection of the claim. The references as a whole, however, lack any appreciation of the methodology recited in claim 33, and accordingly, the claim is non-obvious over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 33 are therefore respectfully requested.

Next, with regard to independent claim 57, this claim generally recites method of providing product support for a computer-related product. The method includes collecting operational data from a plurality of customer computers that utilize the computer-related product during operation of the plurality of customer computers, with at least one computer-implemented intelligent agent, analyzing the operational data from the

plurality of customer computers, and identifying as a result of the analysis an undesirable operational condition associated with the computer-related product in at least one of the customer computers.

In rejecting claim 57, the Examiner relies only on Mikurak. The numerous shortcomings of Mikurak have been discussed above. Nonetheless, Applicants also wish to note that Mikurak does not disclose the claimed feature of "with at least one computer-implemented intelligent agent, analyzing the operational data from the plurality of customer computers," and as such, the claim is novel over Mikurak. In rejecting this specific feature, the Examiner relies on col. 9, lines 27-32 and col. 220, lines 46-56. The passage at col. 9, however, discloses only a hardware implementation as a desktop computer or a workstation. The passage at col. 220 discloses a shopping intelligent agent that searches for requested information. In neither passage, nor in any other portion of the reference of which Applicants are aware, is there any discussion of analyzing operational data collected from a plurality of customer computers using an intelligent agent.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claim 57 is novel over Mikurak and the rejection should be withdrawn. Applicants also submit that the Examiner has established no suggestion in the art to perform analysis with an intelligent agent, as recited in claim 57. Accordingly, claim 57 is also non-obvious over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 57 are therefore respectfully requested.

Next, with regard to independent claim 93, this claim generally recites computer-implemented method of providing product support for a computer-related product. The method includes executing a first intelligent agent to perform a first task associated with remedying an undesirable operational condition associated with a customer computer that utilizes the computer-related product, wherein the first intelligent agent is provided by a first vendor that supplies a first component associated with the computer-related product, and executing a second intelligent agent to perform a second task associated with remedying the undesirable operational condition, wherein the second intelligent agent is provided by a second vendor that supplies a second component associated with the computer-related product.

Mikurak and Ly, as admitted by the Examiner, do not disclose executing first and second intelligent agents provided by first and second vendors to remedy an undesirable operational condition. For this, the Examiner relies on Cheng. Cheng, however, discloses a multi-vendor software update service that supports the ability for user computers to download software updates from multiple vendors.

Of note, however, Cheng does not even mention the concept of an agent. Software updates are not analogous to agents, so the fact that a user computer in Cheng can download software updates from multiple vendors is irrelevant to the claimed invention. Furthermore, the client applications 104 resident on the individual user computers in Cheng are not vendor-specific, but rather support the ability to download vendor specific software updates.

Most importantly, the vendor-specific software updates that are downloaded to user computers in Cheng are completely separate from one another, and operate only to update applications from different vendors that themselves are also entirely separate from one another. Claim 93 is directed to using multiple intelligent agents from multiple vendors to perform multiple tasks that together remedy the same undesirable operational condition. Put another way, claim 93 addresses a single undesirable operational condition by using intelligent agents associated with multiple vendors to perform multiple tasks in connection with remedying that single condition.

Cheng, nor any other the other art cited by the Examiner discloses or even appreciates this concept. The Examiner cites col. 2, line 62 to col. 3, line 12, and col. 10 lines 13-24 of Cheng for allegedly disclosing this feature. However, the first passage discusses only download software updates from multiple vendors to update different software on a user computer. The second passage describes a number of components in a service provider computer, but of note, these components are not agents, nor do they perform multiple tasks in connection with addressing a single, common undesirable operational condition in a computer-related product for a particular customer computer.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claim 93 is non-obvious over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 93 are therefore respectfully requested.

Next, with respect to the various dependent claims, Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejections based upon the dependency of these claims on the aforementioned independent claims. However, Applicants also wish to address a number of these claims which recite additional features that further distinguish these claims from the prior art of record.

For example, claims 2 and 19 recite that the first and second product support agents are configured to communicate with one another. In rejecting these claims, the Examiner relies on col. 2, lines 42-49 of Gomi. However, this passage merely discloses agents communicating with one another in the abstract. There is no disclosure or suggestion of product support agents that communicate with one another, in combination with the other features recited in the claim.

Claims 7 and 21 recite that the first product support intelligent agent is configured to collect operational data associated with the computer-related product, and the second product support intelligent agent is configured to analyze the operational data collected by the first product support intelligent agent to identify an undesirable operational condition for the computer-related product. The Examiner cites col. 8, line 58 to col. 9, line 13 and col. 7, lines 17-65 of Chen. However, Applicants can find no disclosure in any of these passages of an intelligent agent configured to analyze the operational data collected by another intelligent agent for the purpose of identifying an undesirable operational condition. The cited passage at col. 7, in particular, is silent with respect to an intelligent agent having data analysis capabilities.

Claims 9 and 23 recite creating a remedy intelligent agent. The Examiner cites col. 22, lines 14-56 of Mikurak for allegedly disclosing this feature, but Applicants can find no disclosure in the reference that is even arguably relevant to programmatically creating an intelligent agent that remedies an undesirable operational condition.

Claims 10 and 24 recite publishing the remedy intelligent agent with a distribution control that limits distribution of the remedy intelligent agent. The passages cited by the Examiner in Mikurak, at cols. 133, 134, and 166-169 address, at the most, distribution control of electronic framework information. To assert that these passages disclose or

suggest distribution control specifically of remedy intelligent agents in a product support context requires the use of hindsight, and thus would be improper.

Claim 11 recites that the product support program is configured to select the remedy intelligent agent from among a plurality of existing remedy agents. Applicants can find no relevant disclosure in the cited passages at cols. 89 and 90 of Mikurak, and Applicants fail to see how the Examiner is applying the reference against this feature of claim 11. The cited passages do not even deal with product support, so Applicants submit that the passage falls far short of disclosing or suggesting the selection of "remedy" intelligent agents in connection with the other features recited in the claim.

Claims 12 and 25 recite dispatching the remedy intelligent agent between product releases of the computer-related product. In rejecting these claims, the Examiner cites col. 185, lines 27-39 of Mikurak. However, this disclosure merely discusses software update distribution prior to a production stage, and is completely silent with respect to the particular features recited in these claims. Given that the claimed feature permits vendors to fix problems associated with a computer related product in a manner that is outside of a product release cycle, product support is more timely and cost efficient, and as such, the claimed feature represents a substantial improvement over the art cited by the Examiner.

Claims 15 and 28 recite a cross-customer knowledge base including operational data associated with a plurality of customers, and that the second product support intelligent agent is configured to analyze the operational data stored in the cross-customer knowledge base to identify an undesirable operational condition in the computer-related product. In rejecting these claims, the Examiner relies on Mikurak at cols. 130-131 and 249-250. The first passage deals with a customer relationship management embodiment, and has nothing to do with product support. The latter passage, besides containing the word "cross" (used in connection with cross selling in an ecommerce application) is similarly irrelevant in all respects to the concept of a cross customer knowledge base used in a product support application. Applicants question whether the rejection is founded upon anything more than a simple text search for the word "cross," given the total irrelevancy of the passage vis a vis this claimed feature.

Claims 17 and 30 recite that the first and second product support intelligent agents are associated with different vendors. As with claim 93, the Examiner cites Cheng for allegedly disclosing this feature. However, as discussed above, Cheng does not disclose product support intelligent agents associated with different vendors, but only discloses a system that enables software updates from different vendors to be distributed to user computers using the same service.

As a final matter, the Examiner will note that claims 105 and 106 have been added. Support for these claims may be found in claim 6 as originally filed. Applicants submit that these claims are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, and consideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the foregoing, or which might otherwise further this case onto allowance, the Examiner may contact the undersigned at (513) 241-2324. Moreover, if any other charges or credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to Deposit Account 22-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

June 22, 2006  
Date

/Scott A. Stinebruner/  
Scott A. Stinebruner  
Reg. No. 38,323  
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.  
2700 Carew Tower  
441 Vine Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
Telephone: (513) 241-2324  
Facsimile: (513) 241-6234